

However, if a commercial tenant claims direct loss of property or a combination of such loss and moving expenses in a Federal program, the maximum remains at \$3,000.

But nowhere is there compensation for a commercial tenant's goodwill.

"If I moved my store a few blocks away, where I didn't know the people in the area," Mr. Unger said, "I couldn't give credit to customers. My business might be ruined. This would come under goodwill. But I wouldn't be paid for that."

MOVING THE MERCHANDISE

He added:

"Nor are small businessmen paid for their merchandise. I might have \$30,000 worth of stuff in my store. It will sell where I am located.

"If the city were to make me move I could move the merchandise so I wouldn't be paid for it. But could I sell it, say, in Forest Hills? No. I would have to buy different items.

"This has happened to merchants forced out of East Harlem and other areas."

Herman Badillo, deputy commissioner of the real estate department, said that he simply did not know how legislation compensating for goodwill could be drawn up.

"It would have to cover every type of business," he said. "Should a man be compensated if he moves four blocks from his present site but not two? These would be the problems."

FACED BY RUIN

Yet nearly every official concerned agrees that in a small marginal business a man can be financially ruined by being forced to move only several blocks.

Store space in or near housing developments is offered first to former site tenants, but they seldom can afford the increased rents.

Or, if they can afford the increase and do want to return to the area, they have the problem of surviving the year or two while the new development is under construction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3808) to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949, to increase the maximum amount of relocation payments to be made to a business concern displaced by an urban renewal project and to provide a method for ascertaining the amount of such payments, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A COMMISSION FOR THE REVISION OF FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL LAWS AND PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a Commission for the Revision of Federal Agricultural Laws and Programs. Of course, I am aware that nothing can be done toward the enactment of this proposal during this session of the Congress. However, I believe that its official printing at this time may engender study and discussion of the implications of such a Commission to prepare the way for speedy consideration by the next Congress.

Current agricultural programs are costing the U.S. taxpayers an annual average of \$6 billion a year. Ironically, we are asking our fellow citizens to shoulder this tremendous burden without even being able to show some hope

for its future diminution and without being able to claim that it represents anything but a year-by-year holding operation. I believe that there is no other program undertaken by the U.S. Government which meets both of these negative criteria:

First. No hope for probable termination in the future, and

Second. No current effective accomplishment except holding the line.

Mr. President, it is for this reason that we must look to a thorough reevaluation of laws and policies in this field. I do not think that the Department of Agriculture, involved as it is with political policy made by the administration and day-to-day administration of the agricultural program, can do this job. It certainly will lend its expertise to such an effort as recommended by my joint resolution.

Mr. President, in other nations there are lay commissions to do this job. We too have our precedent for special study commissions such as the Hoover Commission. We have no better means in this Nation for working toward the total national interest than the synthesis of ideas among our legislators, administrators, and those from the private economic sector. Such a synthesis is the overriding need, if we are to solve the growing problems of agriculture in the interest of national policy. I very much hope that my proposal will serve as a basis for study before the next Congress and for action next year.

ARMORY SHOW OF 1913—COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMPS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the original "Armory Show of 1913" held in New York City.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3809) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the original "Armory Show of 1913" of New York City, N.Y., introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CUBA—THE PERIL OF THE ANTILLES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Communist presence in Cuba, carrying with it increasing threats to the tranquility of the Western Hemisphere, poses for the United States problems for which ready solutions do not appear at hand. It is vital that, if we are to act with the intelligence and forthrightness required in this crisis, Americans must be informed both as to the facts and as to solutions offered. In the October 5 issue of Life magazine, Clare Boothe Luce, distinguished former U.S. Ambassador to Italy and formerly a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, presents

her exposition of the Cuban situation and offers solutions for our dilemma there. Her article is, as is characteristic of Mrs. Luce, provocative and strong, it merits reading and consideration by all who seek to be informed on the difficulties which beset us in the Caribbean today. Mrs. Luce's article is appended hereto.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA AND THE UNFACED TRUTH—OUR GLOBAL DOUBLE BIND

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

During a nationally televised press conference a few weeks ago President Kennedy said, "I would like to * * * set [the Cuban situation] in perspective." This is precisely what he has failed to do. By resting the case against intervention on a shockingly erroneous estimate of our Cuban dilemma, the President has evaded a desperately urgent task—to alert the people of this Nation to the grave dangers we face.

What are the facts?

"The President feels that Cuba is a bone in his throat." So spoke one of President Kennedy's aids soon after the abortive invasion of the Bay of Pigs. Since then the obstruction in the Presidential gullet has become a large bone of national and international contention. How did it get stuck there in the first place? How big and how dangerous is it? Can it be dislodged short of war?

The President naturally wants to keep these awkward questions out of this fall's congressional elections. But the failure to ask them and to answer them is fraught with danger to the Nation.

Castro began as a bone in the throat of the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago. Two years later, Candidate Kennedy did his eloquent best to get Mr. Nixon to "strangle" on it. Picking the decline of American safety and prestige as his theme, Kennedy pointed to the rise of Castro as prime evidence that "our security and leadership are both slipping away." His Cuban policy was to "let the Cuban people know our determination that they will someday again be free," to "let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere," and especially to "end the harassment * * * of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands." "Thus far," Candidate Kennedy said, "these fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government." "Hopefully," he said, "events may once again bring us an opportunity to [act] on behalf of the cause of freedom in Cuba."

Hopefully, events did bring the newly elected President this opportunity. In April 1961 President Kennedy authorized the Cuban invasion. But at the last and fateful hour he ordered the withdrawal of decisive U.S. air support, abandoning 1,400 "liberty-loving anti-Castro fighters for freedom" to Castro's tanks, jails and firing squads. His profile in courage turned into a profile of indecision.

In 1960, addressing himself to the military aspect of the Cuban situation, Senator Kennedy said, "I think Castro is a source of maximum danger. * * * A Communist menace * * * has been permitted to arise under our very noses, only 90 miles from our shores. * * * [Castro's] transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations * * * by jetplane, missile or submarine * * * is an incredibly dangerous development." Thus, he warned, "the whole Western Hemisphere security system is drastically threatened."

Today President Kennedy says, "Rash talk is cheap, particularly on the part of those

October 12

22078

who do not have the responsibility [for decision]. Referring to Soviet shipments to Cuba, the President now says that these "do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere." He strongly denies that the Communist buildup is such as "to endanger or interfere with our security," or that Cuba is "an offensive military base of significant capacity."

Why is President Kennedy so relatively calm today?

The President and his advisers have constantly failed to understand that the same ideological, political and military necessities which make it essential for the United States to maintain Berlin as a "showcase of democracy" on Russia's border are operating today from Moscow, to maintain Cuba as a "showcase of communism" on our shores.

Castro's Cuba, still only 90 miles off our shores, has the second strongest ground army in our hemisphere. Estimated at 400,000 men, including militia, it has received, since the failure of the invasion, over \$175 million in military aid and supplies from Communist-bloc countries. Communist-made jeeps, jets, tanks, radar, and electronic equipment are almost daily arrivals in Cuban harbors. According to the State Department and intelligence reports, 4,500 Russian soldiers, sailors, and technicians are in Cuba helping Castro. They are training new pilots, ground crews, and artillery men. Just last week Castro announced construction of a 12-million-peso fishing port on the Cuban coast for use by the Russians. Sites for guided missiles and rockets and bases for submarines and submarine detection are possible. Cuba will be capable of inflicting great damage on the U.S. naval installation at Guantanamo. And behind these beefed-up forces stands the U.S.S.R., openly pledged to support them, with its atomic power if necessary.

The bitter truth is that Cuba today is a far more effective base of Communist activity than it was 2 years ago. It is now a bustling, well-organized jumping-off point into all its neighboring countries for Spanish-speaking spies, provocateurs, propagandists, and secret military agents. (Many of them, according to intelligence sources, have been operating among Cuban refugees and Puerto Rican citizens here in the United States.)

Mr. Kennedy indicates that his hopes of a peaceful solution of the Castro problem lie partially in the deterioration of the Cuban political and economic situation. Dangling the prospect of a convenient collapse before this Nation's eyes, he says, "Castro [is] in trouble. . . . His own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed."

What are the chances of a successful rebellion by Castro's disillusioned people? His unpopularity with a great section of his populace can no longer be questioned. But the unjaded remnants of the Cuban underground today no longer have the means or the will to challenge Castro's Soviet-armed firing squads. Like the Hungarians before them, the Cuban people have learned the bitter lesson of resistance: that Soviet Russia will spring to the aid of Soviet dictators wherever they may be, but the United States will not always go to the aid of men fighting for their freedom.

Meanwhile, the rising generation in Cuba is being vigorously indoctrinated with anti-democratic, anti-United States and pro-Russian ideas. It is being taught to think of itself as the vanguard of the Communist liberation in the Western Hemisphere.

Radio Cuba broadcasts around the clock to all the Latin American nations. Their underprivileged masses are told that their economic and political freedom depends on booting out all pro-U.S. politicians, and elevating public officials who stand ready

to join the dynamic ranks of Communist republics, which now, because of Castro, can truthfully be said to girdle the globe.

The United States, Radio Cuba claims, is lending billions of economic aid to its southern neighbors for one reason only: fear of Khrushchev and Castro. American aid, it warns, will die on the vine the day Castro is defeated. The argument is a powerful one. Probably all Latin American governments view Castro and communism at least in part as a dollar-generating program. It would explain why even pro-U.S. leaders are reluctant to take action against him or their own domestic Communists.

President Kennedy has said that "monumental economic mismanagement, supplemented by our refusal to trade with [Castro] has crumbled" the Cuban economy. This seems to suggest the hope that the regime will collapse of its own weight and thereby discredit communism.

How justified is that hope?

There is no question that in the last few years living standards under Castro have deteriorated appallingly—as they have under Walter Ulbricht in East Berlin and Janos Kadar in Hungary. In 1959, Cuban exports were \$675 million and imports \$740 million; today, exports are \$320 million, imports \$350 million. Roughly, Cuba has lost one-half of her world trade. Castro would indeed be ousted by his own people by now—except for one all-important fact: Kremlin support. When Castro came to power in 1959, 80 percent of Cuba's trade was with the United States. Today, 85 percent is with the Communist-bloc countries.

Today Castro and his country are in total hock to Moscow. If Castro should balk at this, or in any other way become a liability or nuisance, the Kremlin will quickly dispose of him.

President Eisenhower is quoted as having said recently that he had heard the term "peaceful blockade" but he didn't know what the term meant. A naval blockade, if it is to succeed, must be continuously maintained and enforced on vessels of all flags. Allied and neutral, no less than "enemy," vessels must be intercepted and cargoes dumped or returned to home ports. International law defines such a blockade as "an act of war carried out by the warships of a belligerent detailed to prevent access or departure from a defined part of the enemy's coast."

Americans will remember that Kaiser Bill's harassment of American shipping in 1917 was construed by Woodrow Wilson as an act of war on the part of Germany against the "neutral" United States. A naval blockade led directly to our entrance into World War I. Consequently, the establishment of a formal U.S. naval blockade against Cuba could be construed as an act of war by any nation whose vessel is so intercepted. It is, of course, reasonable to assume that however much a naval blockade against our allies would gum up our relations with them, they would not war against America for turning back their Cuba-bound trade vessels. What is certain is that Cuba would declare a naval blockade to be an act of war, and that the U.S.S.R. would endorse that declaration.

Thus, putting the Cuban situation in its true perspective would require the President to make an excruciatingly painful admission: That the failure to carry through the Cuban invasion in April 1961 has already had dangerous, and perhaps disastrous, consequences for American global policies. No peaceful action that the United States can presently take can be counted on to end the Soviet buildup in Cuba.

Whatever usefulness or validity the historic Monroe Doctrine may have had before the invasion, the failure of that invasion and subsequent events would seem to have destroyed them. The doctrine, proclaimed by

President James Monroe on December 2, 1823, warned the European powers that "we should consider any attempt . . . to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." (It is an irony of history that what inspired this doctrine was the attempt of Imperial Russia to penetrate "peacefully" into the American Northwest.)

By April of 1961, Castro was openly under the Soviet wing. Mr. Kennedy gave the invasion go-light even though OAS approval had not been secured. But when he withdrew U.S. air support at the last moment, one reason apparently was his consideration for the multilateral concept of the Monroe Doctrine.

Despite such lip-service to the Monroe Doctrine, the President (currently using the voice of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY) now wishes to supplant it with the "Kennedy doctrine." What is the Kennedy doctrine?

An analysis of the President's hard-core position on Cuba shows it to be this: The United States will not initiate any military action against a peaceful extension of Soviet power in our hemisphere, or a defensive Soviet military buildup in Cuba, but it will consider an offensive buildup to be dangerous to our safety. And, in the event of an armed attack by satellite Cuba against the United States or any of its neighbors, the United States is determined not to wait for other OAS nations to take action—it will unilaterally counterattack the attackers.

Upon even closer examination, this Kennedy doctrine looks quite familiar. And so it is. The Kennedy doctrine proves to be the 15-year-old Truman-Eisenhower doctrine, designed to contain Soviet Russia in areas outside the American hemisphere. The essential feature of that doctrine is, and always has been, nonaggression while maintaining the military capacity to retaliate in kind against Communist military initiatives. It incorporates the military tit-for-tat or retaliation principle—the ultimate tit-for-tat being of course, massive retaliation. The rationale behind the doctrine of containment was the realistic acceptance of the European satellite states as legitimate zones of Russian concern and influence. Stripped of its double-talk, the Kennedy doctrine plunks for the application of this old Truman-Eisenhower containment doctrine to our own hemisphere. Apparently so long as the U.S.S.R. does not use Cuba as an offensive base, it is now to be considered as a legitimate zone of Russian power.

So, the United States has now been placed in a global double bind. If the United States should intervene in Cuba, it must do so at the risk of exposing all its military bases and positions in Europe, the Near East, and Asia to the threat of Russian or Communist flanking attacks. But, if it does not intervene and should serious trouble—short of ultimate nuclear war—begin in Berlin, Turkey, Iran, Laos, Vietnam, Formosa, or Korea, the United States now risks exposing the Western Hemisphere not only to constant Soviet reconnaissance but also to flanking attacks from Cuba.

The United States is now faced with two dismaying alternatives: to challenge Russian power in our hemisphere now, at the risk of war breaking out on other global fronts and (unless diplomatic concessions are made quickly there) escalating into world war III; or to sit and wait while Soviet military power is consolidated in our hemisphere, with the very real possibility that communism will take over large areas of Latin America.

It is in this grim global perspective that the people of this Nation must now debate the question of whether or not intervention is "required or justified" in Cuba. In concealing the extent of our dilemma, the President is denying the citizens of this Nation the right of a free people to debate crucial

1962

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

22079

national issues with all the relevant facts before them. Short-range political astuteness may indicate the need to play down the size of the present crisis. But long-range statesmanship solemnly demands that the truth be told.

What is now at stake in the decision for intervention or nonintervention in Cuba is the question not only of American prestige but of American survival. If the decision is not to intervene, then that means the United States accepts the existence of Soviet military and political power in the Western Hemisphere. Postponing the decision to intervene will not make it any easier. The same arguments which are used against intervention today could and would be used when Russia has control of half a dozen hemisphere countries. If the United States deems that Russian military power in this hemisphere is intolerable, it would be the part of wisdom to say so clearly now, and to act accordingly. The vast majority of the American people, including most of the President's critics and opponents, will support the President when he takes action.

THE TIME IS NOW

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are quite used to the war correspondents of the great dailies and wire services traveling to the world's trouble spots to cover a story. The Negro community of New York had the opportunity of receiving such on-the-spot coverage when one of its own, Mr. James L. Hicks, executive editor of the New York Amsterdam News went to Oxford, Miss., to report on the recent unfortunate developments there.

Subsequent to his return Mr. Hicks has written a challenging editorial which merits, I feel, general attention. His challenge is constructive, a plea for understanding, and indicative of his mature philosophy that the solution for wrongs is to right them, not to compound them with further acrimony. The editorial is appended hereto.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIME IS NOW

Student bodies of universities all over the world are generally in the forefront of the most forward-looking steps taken in any nation.

Wherever we have had great reform in industry we have had student bodies, the illegals, if you please, in the forefront of such movements.

And in thinking of this we can't help but note what a great opportunity the students at Mississippi University had to launch, initiate or join in a southwide movement that could quickly bring about the end of such bigotry and foolishness as we have seen recently evidenced in the James H. Meredith case.

What a golden opportunity for the president of the Student Council at the University of Mississippi to be able to start a movement on his own campus that would bring about the complete acceptance of James H. Meredith as a "black rebel" student, the first in the 114 year history of Ole Miss.

Such acceptance of Meredith's admission at Ole Miss is as certain to eventually follow as the day follows the night. It's only a matter of time.

But how wonderful it would be—what great stature the student body of Ole Miss could rise to if the students themselves would today take the situation by the horns, dash silly tradition and say to themselves that time must be "now."

VOTING PROCEDURE IN UNITED NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have received from the Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of United Nations Affairs Harlan Cleveland, a pertinent letter which clarifies a point made by me in debate, in which I said that a nation which, following decisions of the International Court of Justice, fails to pay its current U.N. assessment for 2 years will not automatically lose its right to vote in the General Assembly, but that that right must be denied to it by a vote of the General Assembly.

The Department of State takes the view that that is not so; that delinquent states automatically lose their right to vote if they are more than 2 years in arrears, and that this point may be made on a simple point of order to the President of the General Assembly.

I think this statement is so important that, with the permission of the Department of State, I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated September 28, 1962, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1962.

We are taking the position in the General Assembly that the denial of the right to vote is automatic whenever a country is more than 2 years in arrears.

Article 19 simply says that: "A member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding 2 full years."

The U.S. view, which we have been promoting with other countries, is that this language is fully automatic. As a matter of fact, no country has ever been in the condition described in the sentence I have just quoted from article 19—but several countries paid up part of their arrears shortly before the current General Assembly, to avoid being the guinea pigs under this article. But when and if the conditions do arise, we believe the President of the General Assembly would simply declare that the country in question would not be made a part of the next rollcall or would skip the country's name in calling the roll. (There is precedent for this in other international organizations that have similar "loss of vote" articles.)

That ruling could no doubt be challenged and, if so, would go to a general vote of the General Assembly. Moreover, article 19 also provides that the General Assembly may "permit such a Member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member."

Both the appeal from a ruling by the Chair or an appeal to be excused from the sanction in article 19 on grounds of hardship would require affirmative action by the General Assembly. But the denial of the vote, as such, should be fully automatic.

I mention this because I think it is important that other nations not derive the impression that there is argument in this country among supporters of the United Nations as to whether article 19 would be automatically applied or not. I'm sure you will appreciate the importance of this in the context of the discussions to be held—by Ambassador Klutznick and one of your col-

leagues Senator ALLOTT—in the Fifth Committee of the 17th General Assembly this fall.

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

HARLAN CLEVELAND,
Assistant Secretary.

THE WORLD GROWS UP—AND SO DO WE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the New York Times of this morning there is a news story which can give us at least a little hope that the tragic events in Mississippi have added to the sum total of human understanding. As Mr. Meredith was reported to have said after his registration at the university, it was "not a happy occasion." Yet it was an occasion at which principle, law, and, above all, morality prevailed in the face of an enemy—man's blind fear and hatred of some of his fellows—who has throughout human history compiled a deplorable record of victories.

The news story to which I refer deals with the reaction of those countries to the events in Mississippi, which have an overriding interest in our Nation's policies with respect to its own non-white citizens. Those countries with a nonwhite citizenry of their own are not unaware of the problems they themselves must solve—but in seeking guidance to the solution of these problems they look with great care on the actions of those who are leaders in the world. I believe that our national implementation of the law, in upholding the right of a qualified citizen to an opportunity to receive an education, was vital proof of the sincerity of our public protestations.

Mr. President, I believe also that the favorable reaction cited in this story gives proof of how close to disaster, in terms of our moral standing and our self-respect, we stood last week—and that it gives proof that our cherished way of life can only survive if it lives up to its own standards. I ask unanimous consent to have the news story printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. RACIAL ACTION PRAISED IN AFRICA—FIRM HANDLING OF MISSISSIPPI CRISIS SAID TO HAVE MADE A FAVORABLE IMPRESSION

(By David Binder)

WASHINGTON, October 11.—The Federal Government's firm handling of the Mississippi crisis has made favorable impression in Africa, according to information available here.

At the height of the crisis, when U.S. troops and Federal marshals were dispatched to the University of Mississippi to back the registration of a Negro student, James H. Meredith, the President of Mali, Modibo Keita, cabled President Kennedy his congratulations for acting decisively.

Mr. Keita's government has developed strong ties to the Soviet bloc in recent months, so the cable, dated October 1, was viewed here with surprise and pleasure.

REACTION A SURPRISE

Mr. Kennedy wired his thanks to the Mali leader last October 3.

October 12

22080

At the same time, it was reported that Guinean political leaders reacted with similar approval of the Federal actions in Mississippi.

Rather than deplore the segregationist attitudes of some southerners, which the Guineans knew existed, they are quoted as saying, in effect: "What country in the world would mobilize a whole army to get a Negro student into college?"

These impressions contrast with the expectations of some observers here, who thought that the Mississippi crisis would be regarded as new evidence of racism in the United States.

Qualified observers in Washington declare they are quite pleased with this country's performance in African nations as compared with that of the Soviet bloc.

In Guinea, for example, official doors that were once closed to Americans and open to Russians are now said to be somewhat more ajar for U.S. diplomats.

The prime cause for this change is said to be the so-called Communist plot uncovered in Conakry last December that led to the ouster of the Russian Ambassador.

RUSSIAN FAUX PAS

But U.S. sources contend that the poor performance of Soviet aid and development programs, as well as the ungratifying behavior of Russian technicians, contributed to the wave of Communist influence in Guinea.

American sources contend the Russians committed several faux pas. Once they backslapped Guinean mining officials, calling them "comrade" and using the familiar "tu" (you) in French, rather than the more formal "vous."

The Guineans, it was asserted, resented this familiarity. Soviet officials are said to have shunned contacts with ordinary Guineans. Some natives, it was said, suspect them of snobbery and racist sentiments.

On the other hand, the Americans assert, G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, who is a backslapper with the best of them, immediately achieved rapport with Guinean leaders, including President Sekou Toure, during a recent visit.

The difference, according to observers, was that Mr. Williams knew his "tu" from his "vous" and demonstrated appreciation for Guinean sophistication in political affairs.

The list of recent American gains and Russian setbacks in Guinea, attested to by U.S. sources, is a long one.

It includes such items as the ouster of about 60 French Communist teachers along with the Russian Ambassador; the padlocking of a Communist book store that had been distributing propaganda; enactment of a law guaranteeing foreign investments; the joining of the International Monetary Fund; an invitation to the Peace Corps; and votes against the Soviet bloc in the United Nations.

YOUTH OF ALL NATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have recently received a letter from Miss Eugenia Barton, a young lady in her senior year at Cornell University, telling me of the organization, Youth of All Nations, Inc., YOAN for short. YOAN has established a correspondence exchange between young people throughout the world to introduce individual citizens of the United States to those of other countries. Each participant in the program makes a formal application to YOAN, which includes pertinent background information about his hobbies, education, and language abilities.

Miss Barton has described to me the value which 4 years of such correspond-

ing with young people in other countries has meant to her. I wish to call this to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate, because I believe that it is through such programs which facilitate the frank exchange of ideas by our youth that the people of this world may eventually find a wider and deeper understanding to help us to live together and work together.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Barton's letter be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I am studying international relations at Cornell University, where I am a senior. This summer I have been working as a guide at the United Nations. (Incidentally, because I speak Russian fluently, I have been assigned to guide some visiting Russians, too.)

This letter concerns an organization to which I have belonged for 4 years—Youth of All Nations, Inc., YOAN for short, located at 16 St. Luke's Place, New York, N.Y. YOAN's purpose is to acquaint young people all over the world with each other through carefully arranged personal correspondence. However, it is not a simple addresses exchange, but prospective members must first answer questions about their schooling, ambitions, hobbies, knowledge of foreign languages, etc. Then, they are introduced to someone in another country with similar interests. The program is primarily aimed at college age students and more serious teenagers rather than young children.

Members of YOAN also receive the organization's magazine, called Mirror for Youth, to which they contribute their experiences and ideas, and share their letters; for, of course, no one member can possibly correspond with all countries.

I cannot express how much membership in YOAN has benefited me. Not only has my international understanding increased, but now I have good friends in Italy and Sweden, and I am just beginning correspondence with members in Spain and South Vietnam. We exchange viewpoints, political ideas, local news, experiences, etc. I am also learning why our culture and politics are sometimes criticized, and why certain misunderstandings about Americans might arise.

My friends who belong to YOAN also think very highly of it. The organization is nonprofit, nonsectarian, and nonpartisan, and is headed by Miss Clara Lelser, its founder. Its work should be made more widely known and it should also be better supported, because it has been doing an excellent job in increasing international understanding. The young people who belong to YOAN are usually the more articulate elements of their societies and in a few years they will be the leaders. If they can be helped to understand the same generation in other areas of the world, then much is being done to help peace.

Do you think it would be possible for you to include something about YOAN in your reports to your constituents? In print or by radio-TV? If you will do this, please ask interested persons aged 14 to 24 to send a self-addressed, stamped envelope, and 10 cents (for handling costs) to Youth of All Nations, 16 St. Luke's Place, New York 14, N.Y. If you wish more information, please contact Miss Lelser or me. The YOAN telephone number is Watkins 4-1368.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,

EUGENIA BARTON.

SARATOGA BATTLEFIELD NATIONAL PARK AND CEMETERY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution I have received from the board of supervisors of Schenectady County, N.Y., with reference to the need for a third battlefield cemetery in that area.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 141

Resolution on Saratoga Battlefield National Park National Cemetery urged

Whereas Federal authorities have determined there is a need for an additional national cemetery in New York State to meet the growing demands for burial space for our honored veterans; and

Whereas the two existing national cemeteries are located at Elmira and Farmingdale—both approximately 200 miles from Schenectady County; and

Whereas it would seem logical to establish a third national cemetery in the immediate area; and

Whereas facilities and space are now available at the Saratoga Battlefield National Park as a memorial site that would lend dignity and prestige to such a cemetery: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Schenectady County Board of Supervisors give its full support and approval of efforts now being made by the Schenectady County Committee of the American Legion to establish a national cemetery at Saratoga Battlefield National Park; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to our congressional representatives in Washington and the Schenectady County American Legion.

PROPOSED FEDERAL CONSOLIDATED BALANCE SHEET

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a long-time supporter of a Federal capital budget I was delighted to read in a recent column by the former administration's Bureau of the Budget chief, Maurice Stans, a suggestion that the Federal budget provide a consolidated balance sheet listing the Government's assets and liabilities, in addition to the customary cash-in and cash-out statement.

Mr. Stans correctly points out that the taxpayer would like to know how much the Government has invested in "loans, stockpiles, securities, farm products, foreign currencies, working funds, public buildings, Government-owned corporations, and so on."

If such a balance sheet were prepared, it would indicate the extent of Federal investment in the Federal power program, together with the handsome return which the U.S. Treasury is earning on this investment. In fact, such a balance sheet might prevent Mr. Stans and the private power companies from parroting endlessly the line about how much the Federal power program allegedly costs the taxpayers.

Mr. Stans, in another column published in the Washington Post on September 30, carried this unsupported charge, and others, to ridiculous lengths. He contended that if only the private

Motor Vehicle Parking Agency and in the process wrecked any hopes for rational parking strategy at the very time our midcity building boom is creating a parking crisis—and with it a potential blighting influence—of major proportions.

But all the blame cannot be unburdened at the doorstep of an obstructionist Congress.

Civic and governmental leadership in the National Capital area is in a bad way. The agencies to which we look for leadership are fighting among themselves and in the process, paralyzing our decisionmaking faculties.

GUERRILLA WARFARE

We have seen our desperately needed expressway system lose all forward momentum during the past 12 months, falling prey to jurisdictional guerrilla warfare between transit partisans and roadbuilders. Mr. Stolzenbach, Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, conceived it as one of his first duties to polarize the transit-freeway battle.

I can think of no more palpable nonsense than the way the obstructionists have urged us to delay project after project until Mr. Stolzenbach's plan is finished. One would think Mr. Stolzenbach was away on a flight to Mars; he has never yet once said that any action could be taken without injuring his mysterious plan.

Our Planning Commission, with one foot solidly planted in the year 2000, has recently tried to soft-shoe its way through controversies over the highway program, and the need for renewal of Georgetown's industrial waterfront. The Commission has not exercised its full measure of leadership in coordinating Federal moves throughout the metropolitan area.

DART GAME

And the Federal Government has been one of the worst transgressors. Executive agencies have been playing a reckless game of darts with the map of Metropolitan Washington.

Instead of working as a positive influence in shaping a rational metropolitan environment, it has done just the opposite. The Central Intelligence Agency's new home at Langley did not even place in a list of 25 sites picked after careful planning research. But Allen Dulles, you may remember, wanted a Princeton type campus setting for his employees and Congressman BROXHILL could not have been more sympathetic.

If that massive blockhouse of the CIA's is campus-type architecture, then I think we ought to rename the Pentagon Harvard Yard.

Another incredible monument to Federal whimsy is the Atomic Energy Commission building, a 45- or 60-minute or longer drive from downtown Washington. The secretaries were the first to rebel at this exile to exurbia. As usual, they had more sense than the planning technicians.

In fact, we have become so numbed by this sort of folly that the scandalous waste of moving NSA to Fort Meade has hardly ever been noted. And now we have the Bureau of Standards and other dispersal-minded agencies doing violence to the most elementary concepts of sound metropolitan planning.

CHAOS UNLEASHED

The dispersers and decentralizers in the Federal Establishment have failed to prove the wisdom of their argument. Instead they have further unleashed the forces of urban chaos in the National Capital region.

There is, on the contrary great sense in the new cluster of Federal buildings along Independence Avenue and at the gateway to the new Southwest. But without companion action to accommodate both the traffic and parking demands of this vast new

employment center, it will only build new blight factors into our downtown.

Because of the city's enormous public and private investment in the Southwest, GSA has a compelling responsibility to provide underground parking in the Southwest Mall far at least 4,000 cars. Secondly, GSA should join others in demanding the earliest possible completion of the inner loop, no later than 1970.

There is urgent need for a strong, central checkrein over the various agencies in the executive branch.

It is notable that Washington's best days, as far as the executive branch is concerned, were the years from 1953 to 1958 when under President Eisenhower, Gov. Sherman Adams displayed continuing and intelligent interest in National Capital affairs.

Someday Washington should recognize formally Governor Adams' contribution to our city.

KENNEDY ACTION

It is strange, on the other hand, that the New Frontier waited more than a year and a half before extending its influence to the citizens of Metropolitan Washington through the appointment of Charlie Horsky as Presidential Adviser on National Capital Affairs.

Washington, after all, has been our President's most permanent hometown. It has also been home to many who serve in his administration.

The saving of Lafayette Square is just one example of how much can be achieved with the active, personal interest of President and Mrs. Kennedy. And we can now welcome enthusiastically the appointment of Mr. Horsky for giving institutional support to the President's determination to help Washington.

In Congress, the work of Senator ALAN BIBLE and his Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems has shown us what can be achieved with constructive and enlightened leadership on Capitol Hill. Without Senator BIBLE, we would certainly not have been even as far along toward transit modernization as we are today.

And now I should like to place before you tonight an agenda for action in the National Capital region.

FIVE-YEAR GOALS

It is a program not for the year 2000 but for 1967—5 years from now, something that falls within our mortal capabilities. We have the tools, the money, the civic genius to achieve it. We need only the will.

First, a clean Potomac in which we can once again swim and fish.

Second, a national cultural center to enhance both our Nation and our culture.

Third, although my editorial colleagues at the Washington Post disagree with me, a national aquarium to celebrate nature along with our zoo and opera. For I believe the gifts and wonders of the ocean are as enhancing to man as opera.

Fourth, the rapid flowering of a new downtown which will serve as the vital center rather than the shame of our metropolitan area.

Fifth, an innerloop freeway that is fully under contract.

Sixth, a functioning metropolitan authority to manage the financing and construction of a regional mass transit system.

Seventh, modern high-speed subway service in our downtown core.

Eighth, a humane and efficient relocation service for families and businesses to insure that our public works undertakings do not streamroller over proprietary rights and individual initiative.

Ninth, completion of plans for the long-neglected Southeast and Northeast quadrants of our city, along both sides of the Anacostia.

Tenth, the blossoming of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Eleventh, completion of the Three Sisters Bridge with perhaps a start on the Fourth or Fifth Sister, as well as a completed access road system to Dulles Airport.

OTHER ASPECTS

But we cannot build a greater National Capital with public works alone.

We must also set our 1967 sights on such goals as these:

Achieving equal housing and job opportunities for Negroes and other minorities.

Strengthening our institutions of higher learning so that we may attract the Nation's keenest and most cultivated minds as well as our due share of the new scientific industries on our periphery.

Coming to grips with our spiraling welfare problems in a way that will attack the underlying social conditions from which our relief loads spring.

Creating larger banking and commercial institutions worthy of a world capital.

Getting more intelligent and responsive representation in the District committees of Congress.

In conclusion, I would say that there has been some good news during the past year to go with the bad. Mr. Horsky's appointment was a heartening demonstration that the administration is recognizing its responsibility to the National Capital.

COOPERATION NEEDED

But, remarkable as he is, and prodigal as are his gifts, he is no miracle man.

He will need the ear of a sympathetic President.

He will need the cooperation of a citizenry that must stop its nay-saying and must, in the words of New York's Bob Moses, ignore the "babel of strident voices" that counsel delay and negativism.

It is not simply an array of problems that face Metropolitan Washington. It is a full-blown crisis.

We must learn to accept the signs of change and growth that will make our Federal City as different in the year 2000 as it was in 1924.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Graham speaks with great feeling and deep concern over long-range future planning. He expresses anxiety over the apparent failure of those responsible to recognize that the present and near future—not alone the distant years—must be reckoned with in any sensible planning for the Capital City of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, as the legislative body of this Capital, the Congress of the United States must heed the warning and advice that this dedicated citizen speaks to. I hope that Mr. Graham's words do not fall on deaf ears in the Congress, and I trust that the official planners look to tomorrow and next year as well as the year 2000.

As one of many in this House of Representatives jealous of and interested in the beauty and proper growth of Washington, I congratulate Mr. Graham for the thought that went into and the excellence of his address to an organization that is so vitally concerned with the affairs of this great city.

PREVIOUS SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

(Mr. MATHIAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 87th Congress lingers into the middle of the month of October and witnesses the falling leaves in the streets

22014

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 11

of Washington, many Members of the House have expressed curiosity as to the precedents for such a protracted session. For their information I should like to quote the following statistics with regard to previous sessions of unusual length, which occurred during an election year.

In 1940 the session lasted 366 days—from January 3, 1940, to January 3, 1941.

In 1922 the session lasted 292 days—from December 5, 1921, to September 22, 1922.

In 1914 the session lasted 328 days—from December 1, 1913, to October 24, 1914.

In 1888 the session lasted 321 days—from December 5, 1887, to October 20, 1888.

RETIRING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(Mr. GALLAGHER (at the request of Mr. GARY) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as another session comes to an end, all of us are saddened by the knowledge that some of our good friends and colleagues are retiring from the Congress. I rise today to salute the devoted service, patriotism, and workmanship of five of my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Representatives ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, CHESTER E. MURROW, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, LAURENCE CURTIS, and HORACE SEELY-BROWN, Jr., will retire from the Congress and from their seats on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Each of these distinguished representatives has earned the respect and admiration of their fellow colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Although a Democrat and a junior member of the committee, I have received their unfailing assistance and good will in my work on the committee. Without partisan feeling and with the utmost devotion to duty, these Members of Congress have attempted to work for the ideal that only by advancing and protecting freedom throughout the world can the United States maintain its security and dedication to the principles on which it was founded.

I salute them for their dedicated service to their country and to their constituencies, and I wish them all success in their future endeavors.

RANSOM MONEY FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we all have great compassion for the men and the families of men taken prisoner by Castro's Communist regime during the Bay of Pigs invasion attempt of Cuba last year. While we all have compassion for their plight and the people of the United States greatly feel that the causes of freedom must be upheld, the

principles of this Nation do not condone the payment of ransom by the U.S. Government.

I have already urged the President and the Secretary of State to refuse to allow any U.S. tax dollars to be used for this purpose.

This Nation was faced with a ransom payment in 1805 and defeated those who were so brazen to demand it. That incident occurred in Tripoli and we refused to pay ransom while our Nation was young.

We should do no less while our Nation is great.

(Mr. HERLONG (at the request of Mr. SIKES) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. HERLONG'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PELLY for October 13 and October 15 on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DEROUNIAN, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes, following the special order granted to Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. GIAIMO (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), today and tomorrow, for 30 minutes each, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. BARRY of New York), for 10 minutes, on October 12.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. BARRY of New York), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. BARRY of New York), for 15 minutes, on October 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WALTER and to include an article from the current edition of World Affairs.

Mr. BECKWORTH and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. WILLIAMS in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks on the conference report on H.R. 12135.)

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama (at the re-

quest of Mr. LIBONATI) and include extraneous matter, notwithstanding it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$562.50.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. EVERETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SELDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. ZABLOCKI) preceding his own remarks on retirement of Foreign Affairs Committee members.

Mr. PILLION (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FULTON (at the request of Mr. BARRY) in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BETTS and to include extraneous matter which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$270.

Mr. BETTS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LIBONATI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY the remarks he made in colloquy with Mrs. St. George in connection with the retirement of JOHN RAY from Congress.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. BROOMFIELD at the conclusion of Mrs. BOLTON'S special order on the retiring members of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. TOLL in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. MACDONALD in two instances.

Mr. ABBITT in two instances.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri in two instances.

Mr. PURCELL.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. DULSKI in eight instances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances and to include tables.

Mr. GIAIMO in six instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GRIFFIN in five instances.

Mr. DEROUNIAN in six instances.

Mr. WEIS in five instances.

Mr. HALL.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. WIDNALL in three instances.

Mr. TUPPER.

Mr. GUBSER in five instances.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in six instances.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. MORSE in five instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PELLY) and to include extraneous matter:)